

Therefore, the powers of the Assembly are there. If the Hon'ble Members want to say anything, they may do so and there is nothing objectionable. Article 203 will be followed at the time of voting on demands. As regards article 204, it refers to Appropriation Bill which will be placed before the House in proper order, but in the present case there is no provision as such. Now, the question, therefore, is that the constitutional provisions are apart from the rules of procedure. The only question before the House is that the rules of procedure are followed. Therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred upon me by rule 171, I suspend the provisions contained in rule 168 and call upon the Hon'ble Deputy Minister for Finance, to move the demands.

SUPPLEMENTARY AND ADDITIONAL DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR 1967-68—(3rd Instalment)

Sri H. R. ABDUL GAFFAR (Deputy Minister for Finance).—Sir, on the recommendation of the Governor and on behalf of the Minister for Finance, Planning, Commerce and Industries, I beg to move :

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 6,00,100 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year for the period ending 31st day of March 1968 in respect of ‘State Excise Duties’ ”

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—Motion moved :

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 6,00,100 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year for the period ending 31st day of March 1968 in respect of ‘State Excise Duties’ ”.

Along with the Demand, other Demands *viz.* No. 10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 36, 38, 39, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48 and 54 are deemed to have been moved and hon'ble members may offer their observations in regard to the then Demands also.

†Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, I raise a point of order. I invite your kind attention to rule 311 read with article 205 of the Constitution of India. The present supplementary estimates which have been moved and which are before this House, they can be taken for consideration as Supplementary Estimates or they are to be considered as Excess Grants. For this I submit that if they are Excess grants they could be considered in the form of Supplementary grants. This point I will substantiate in this why. There is a difference between the

(SRI M. NAGAPPA)

Supplementary Grants and Excess Grants. For that I will first quote article 204, sub-clause (3) which reads as follows :

“204 (3) Subject to the provisions of articles 205 and 206, no money shall be withdrawn from the Consolidated Fund of the State except under appropriation made by law passed in accordance with the provisions of this article.”

Therefore, it is mandatory on the Government that it cannot utilise the amount, unless it is sanctioned by this August House, and if anything is to be done it must be according to the provisions laid down in the Constitution, i.e., article 205. Now for the purpose of this it is in accordance with article 205 of the Constitution. For that reason, I will read sub clause (1) (a) of article 205 first :

“205. (1) The Governor shall—

(a) if the amount authorised by any law made in accordance with the provisions of article 204 to be expended for a particular service for the current financial year is found to be insufficient for the purposes of that year or when a need has arisen during the current financial year for supplementary or additional expenditure upon some new service not contemplated in the annual financial statement for that year.”

So, this clause (a) refers to the supplementary and additional grants. Now, clause (b) refers to Excess Grants, which reads in this way :

“205. (1) (b) if any money has been spent on any service during a financial year in excess of the amount granted for that service and for that year.”

Sir, if you see the demands, one by one or all, whether they come under article 205 clause (1) (a) or under clause (1) (b) and if they come under clause (b) whether such supplementary estimates can be considered if they are brought under clause (b) is the question : for that I will submit one or two important demands, i.e., demand Nos. 9, 12, 15, 17, 18, 20 and so many other demands, particularly I will read some of them. First I will read Demand No. 12—based on actuals and also due to the payment of Bills relating to previous years, out of the current year's budget.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—When was it paid ? When did it come for payment and in what year ? That date is important.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, I will exactly distinguish as to when it has to be paid and how it is to be paid.

It is said here “based on actuals and also due to payment of the bills relating to previous year out of the current year's budget provision of Rs. 85,000, additional allotment to the extent of Rs. 75,000 is necessary under this head”. So, this could have been brought as an

excess grant in that particular year. They have expended the amount without the permission of the House under the present year's Budget and now they want excess amount in the shape of Rs. 75,000, because that amount, without any sanction has been expended by them.

Some of the important demands are not coming under the financial year's budget. If any amount is taken out from the Contingency Fund, it will definitely come under excess grant. I will quote from Ha-burphy's Laws of England Third Edition, Volume 23, page 4. They have stated what is excess grants; if a demand exceeds in any year an amount of money which Parliament has allowed it to spend, then it must obtain the vote for the extra expenditure. This is obtained by means of additional grant called Excess Grant which should be sanctioned by the Parliament as soon as possible after the excess of expenditure has been ascertained. Then I quote Practice and Procedure of Indian Parliament by S. S. More on page 446. It is said that supplementary and additional grants would be necessary only when the amount named in ordinary estimates for a particular service is found to be insufficient for the purpose of current year or need arises during the current year for expenditure for that year. Only these two conditions are laid down under article 205. Please see these demands which I have mentioned just now and find out whether they come under the definition of supplementary or additional grants or whether they come under the Excess grants, and if they come under the excess grants, whether such a thing can be taken cognizance of by this House and considered as a supplementary grant. For that I will quote two incidents. One is, if greater part of supplementary demand has already been expended from the contingency fund, then, the Government cannot submit a supplementary grant but excess grant. I will submit from the same page 446 of S. S. More. There it is clearly stated that when greater part of supplementary demand asked for has already been expended, proper and regular procedure would be to make a demand for excess grant and not supplementary demand. For this I will submit one ruling of the Legislative Assembly Debate, Volume No. 2, 1929, pages 989-90. There it is stated, that demand for money already spent in excess of voted grant should not be made by way of supplementary demand but in the form of an excess demand. Secondly the same has been accepted in the practice and procedure book written by Shri Kaul on page 564. There it is said that the demands for money already spent in excess of voted grants are not made by way of supplementary grants, but in the form of excess grants. So, in this manner, if we consider the present supplementary estimates, each of the demands will come under the category of this definition. So, I humbly submit that these supplementary estimates which are placed before this House are not supplementary estimates under article 205 (1) (a) of the Constitution, but they come under article 205 (1) (b) of the Constitution. So, they cannot be taken unless they are placed before this House as Excess grant. I will submit why the Government is not bringing them in the shape of excess grants. It is only to save its skin and throw mud in the eyes of the people of this country. That is why they are coming before this House

(SRI M. NAGAPPA)

with supplementary budget by saying previous year's Bills have been adjusted in this. If an expenditure is not incurred in the financial year and if it has been forwarded to the budget in this year, then it is too late to present the estimates. The Department must draw upon the contingencies Fund to make good the deficiency. Then the excess is voted upon, telling them not to do it again. If they come in the form of excess grant, it will be a warning to the present Government that they have committed a mistake and they have committed a fraud on the people by presenting such supplementary grants and not presenting excess grants before this House. I submit most of the demands submitted on the floor of the House are all excess grants and not supplementary grants. They cannot be brought in any way other than as excess grants.

† Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, the Hon'ble member has said that this is really a demand for excess grants and not supplementary grant. He quoted articles 204 and 205 and Shankar Rao More and other books. I will presently inform you that I am also quoting from other sources. In the first place so far as article 204(3) is concerned; it reads as follows:

“(3) Subject to the provisions of articles 205 and 206, no money shall be withdrawn from the Consolidated Fund of the State except under appropriation made by law passed in accordance with the provisions of this article.

That only means that moneys will have to be drawn subject to rules 205 and 206. Let us see what is article 205:

“(a) if the amount authorised by any law made in accordance with the provisions of article 204 to be expended for a particular service for the current financial year is found to be insufficient for the purposes of that year or when a need has arisen during the current financial year for supplementary or additional expenditure upon some new service not contemplated in the annual financial statement for that year.”

In terms of this article, the Government is called upon to submit a supplementary demand or an excess demand or an additional demand. These are the three things that the Government is called upon to present. The Hon'ble Member says that since the moneys which were due last year were paid this year, this becomes an excess grant. It is not an excess demand Sir. This is only a supplementary demand because it has been paid this year. The question of excess demand for a financial year does not arise at all unless the supplementary budget has not been presented. If the supplementary budget has been presented, there is no question of excess grants. So Sir, I submit that you have already pointed out while he was reading article (b) of 205, you emphasised on the phrase ‘for that year’. That is very important. ‘For that year’ means that year which has already elapsed. If that year has elapsed and Government did not take the care to bring in a supplementary demand,

in that case, excess demands will have to be made in the next year. You also said that so far as supplementary demand is concerned, if there is insufficiency of money provided in the Budget and the Government is called upon to incur expenditure on what is called new service or the instruments of new service all these things come. This is the financial year and these supplementary demands have been presented. This contains cases where money has been found to be insufficient and we have come with this supplementary demand.

I will also quote here—the Hon'ble Member quoted Shankarrao More. I will quote from Mookherjee: He says:

“It some times happens that money spent by the Department in excess of the amount granted by the Legislature when it is anticipated that the expenditure will go beyond the amount sanctioned, a supplementary estimate is ordinarily presented. If there is no time to take a supplementary grant, then excess expenditure may be unavoidable...”

If the Government fails to take or if there is no time for the Government to take the sanction of the House by means of supplementary grants, and the Government spends more, that comes under excess demand.

In the next para he says:

“The question of regularisation however arises. After the accounts of the year in which excess expenditure has been incurred have been audited and the exact amount ascertained, and the Public Accounts committee if any, has reported on it.....”

There are certain instances when Government spends money and Government does not bring a supplementary grant, and this has been pointed out by the Accountant General saying that moneys in excess of the amount voted has been spent and it is also submitted to the Public Accounts Committee—after all this is done, the question of bringing excess demands before the House arises. This is the financial year and the year 1967-68 is not yet over. That is why we have come before the House with a demand for Supplementary Grants. We feel that the money provided in the original budget is not sufficient and that is why we have come. There is no excess expenditure in the sense that is pointed out here.

† Sri DIGAMBARA RAO B. KALMANKAR.—While supporting the point of order raised by Sri Nagappa, I also want to show how there is difference between clause (1) (a) and (2) of article 25. After that I will also come to article 115 of the Constitution. Similar provision is also made regarding the transaction before Parliament. It has been said:

“(1) (a) If the amount authorised by any law made in accordance with the provisions of article 204 to be expended for a particular service for the current financial year is found to be insufficient for the purpose of that year.....”

(SRI DIGAMBARA RAO B. KALMANKAR)

In this supplementary, estimate are to be found on very many of the items on which monies have been spent without taking the sanction from this House and there are several such items : I can point out Demand No. 20 wherein it is mentioned.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—I am aware of this. The member need not repeat. If there is any fresh point, he can mention.

Sri DIGAMBARA RAO B. KALMANKAR.—My submission is, it has been mentioned in KAUL'S Practice and Procedure : I will read article 205 (b) :

“ if any money has been spent on any service during a financial year in excess of the amount granted for that service and for that year.....”

My submission is that this particular estimate that has come before this House is a supplementary estimate. This is not an estimate of excess grants and as it is seen from the reading of these demands they are excess grants. So, there is a defect in it. For these items there is a separate estimate to be prepared and they must come only in that way only :

I am reading page 56 of KAUL : about Article 115.

“ if the amount authorised to be expended by any law made in accordance with the provisions of 114 to be expended for a particular service for the current financial year is found to be insufficient for the purposes of that year, or when a need has arisen during the current financial year for supplementary or additional expenditure upon some now service not contemplated in the annual financial statement for that year, or, ... the President shall cause to be laid before both Houses of Parliament another statement showing the estimated amount of that expenditure or cause to be presented to the House of the people a demand for such excess as the case may be.”

It is a separate thing. For the excess expenditure, there must be a separate estimate and my submission is that this supplementary estimate does not come under the criteria mentioned for supplementary estimates. These are items relating to excess expenditure which has already been incurred without a vote being taken from this House. That is my submission.

Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—In support of the point of order raised by Mr. Nagappa, sanction was accorded by voting for the settlement of some pending Bills amounting to Rs. 23 lakhs of rupees and the S.S.L.C. examination was conducted in September 1966. Some budget allotments were made.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—I have read it. It need not be repeated.

SRI H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—My submission is that these items are excess grants which are included in these supplementary Demands. These are not at all supplementary demands. There is a defect to that extent and this may be set right. This cannot be taken up now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—I have heard very learned arguments from both sides on the point whether any excess expenditure has come up before the House and whether it is open to the Government to present it as a supplementary demand under article 205. Article 205 says that if any money already voted is found to be insufficient, in that case, the Government may come forward before the Hon'ble House for Grant. Clause (b) of article 205 speaks about net money which has been spent on any service during a financial year in excess of the amount granted for that service and for that year. Now it is contended by hon. member Sri Nagappa that the amount is already spent and expenditure incurred and therefore it becomes excess expenditure and so it cannot come before the House in the form of supplementary demands and that it should go before the Public Accounts Committee and it is for the Public Accounts Committee to recommend whether that amount should be brought before the Assembly in the form of excess grant.

The hon. member Sri Nagappa and other members who supported him have failed to mark one distinction. Suppose a certain amount had been provided for the S. S. L. C. Examination and it had to be paid in the year 1966-67, but the actual payment exceeded the amount granted. Then only it becomes excess expenditure.

11-30 A.M.

Now as pointed out by the Hon'ble Minister for Parliamentary Affairs the amount is not actually paid in that year, but the expenditure is actually incurred in the present financial year and therefore it cannot be excess pertaining to that year. Since the Government find that the amount allotted for a particular service is exceeded, they have come before the House for an additional amount in order to recoup the amount that is already spent in the current year and not in the previous year. The amount spent in previous years other than the current year should not come before the House in the form of supplementary demands but it becomes excess demand. Since the demands are made in the current year in the form of supplementary demands in connection with amounts expended in the present financial year, I think such demands are covered by article 205 (a) and (b) and so I rule that the demands made are in order. Hon. members can make their observations regarding the demands.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I oppose the Third Instalment of the Supplementary Demands for the years 1967-68 that has now been placed before the House. While doing so, I would like to bring to your notice that according to the original budget estimates for the year 1967-68 for these demands under consideration, what was the grant

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA)

sanctioned, and what are the additional demands that have come up before the House from time to time. The first one as I said was in the year 1967 July and that was for Rs 3.47 crores. The second was in December 1967 for Rs. 3.79 crores and the third one that is now placed is for Rs. 36.79 crores. All these will come to Rs. 44.05 crores. This will be nearly one fifth of the total expenditure that has been allotted in the budget according to the budget estimates 1967-68. Why I am bringing this point for your consideration is that there is no reason or rhyme in the way this Government have been spending money according to their caprices, whims and fancies as it suits their convenience. That I will presently show when we go through the various figures. After all, the system of finance budgeting is governed by certain financial canons. The Government ought to know that before framing the budget. There is a schedule given as to how budgets are to be prepared. When once they do it in the ordinary procedure, as we can see in other countries and in other places where the Finance Minister husbands the resources of the State judiciously and cautiously and in a discreet manner, there is not much of a variation between the budget, the revised and the actuals. In this case they do not know their own mind as to how their budgets will have to be prepared. I can understand the reason for that is that they do not know the income. All that they are going to plan according to the money as and when they receive from the Central Government. The Central Government always tell them, be careful, be cautious. They have been dinning into their ears : "we cannot give you any overdraft ; we cannot allow you to spend moneys in an excessive manner". But still they go on. When once they find they have been reimbursed immediately they begin to adjust their budgets according to their desires. That is the reason why we find this huge colossal amount. In the old days the budget that they have now placed as supplementary demands would be 12 years' budget. That they have now placed in the form of a supplementary demands. So what I am saying is that there is no financial canon or any rule this Government have been following in the matter of framing their budget. That will be clear if you kindly look into the annexures. There you will see how callous these gentlemen are. Now when we look into the Annexure, the first Government Order starting from Serial No. 1 starts from 13th December 1967. So far as all these amounts are concerned, my friend Sri Nagappa is perfectly correct in stating that these are all excess grants. Some have come in as new items for which I shall presently show.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—On that point does he not think that all the payments have come in for the current year ?

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I say that the observation of the Chair is factually correct. The first order is dated 13th December 1967. You will see that in the month of December this Assembly sanctioned items 1 to 5. Then from item 6, you will see that it has come up in the

month of January, when they knew the Budget Session would be coming. Still they sanctioned items 7 and 8. Then in the month of February they definitely know that this House would be summoned on 19th February. Still items 15 to 34, nearly 20 items, were sanctioned by them during this period when this House was about to be summoned or was summoned. That is, commencing from item No. 21. That is, from 19th February, the day on which this House is summoned. They have spent a sum of Rs. 2 lakhs on General Education. Starting like that, you will see huge amounts, in some cases, up to Rs. 50 lakhs, Rs. 40 lakhs, and things like that. They have gone on spending. The last one is on 11th March 1968. What does it show? Do these gentlemen take this House seriously? Or, do they think of it at all? Is this the way the finances of the State should be squandered? Unfortunately, it is these gentlemen that are at the helm of affairs in this State! Did these gentlemen know what they are doing? They spend money from whatever sources they get, without plan or provision. Where was the anxiety or hurry to do so in such a surreptitious manner without bringing the items before this House? If they really wanted the money, they could have come forward with the demand since this House was summoned from 19th February. They did not do it. They came forward after spending the money up to the last pie. They have not fortunately spent any money on the 16th March! We are sitting here and they could have at least, sent some cyclostyled copy about the expenditure. The last amount they have spent is on the 11th March. Is this the way of the spending money? Have the Government any sense of proportion? The other day, the Finance Minister waxed eloquent in his marathon speech, saying that 'we have managed very nicely; we have done so wonderfully.' The wonderful thing about it is, they have managed so nicely having spent freely, spending in any manner they like.

I can show from figures that most of these amounts have been distributed as loans to their favourites; they have given moneys to dying or dead industries. They have given money to those in whom they have subsisting interest, if I may say so. I will tell you what are the amounts they have brought before us. Here is a case which is going to be a bad debt. It is an unbearable load on the heads of our children and grand-children. Still the hon'ble Finance Minister waxed eloquent and said, we have left assets. Assets of what value? Very doubtful value. I am confining myself to the Demands that have been placed before us.

I start with Demand No. 9 on page 2. It is said, the amount is very small. I am not making too much fetish of it. But I am only pointing out the way in which this figure has come before the House after a lapse of three years. I really want to know from the hon'ble Deputy Minister for Finance or his Minister, whether this has been given retrospective sanction because this sum of Rs. 3,100 is said to be the medical expenditure of the Ex-Chairman of the Legislative Council. This amount is said to have been spent during the period from 10th

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA)

September 1964 to 15th November 1964 and that in view of the amendment to the Mysore Legislature (Presiding Officers) Medical Attendance Amendment and (Special) Rules, 1967, this expenditure has been sanctioned in 1968. But this amount was spent in the year 1964. I really want to know whether this amount of Rs. 3,100 has been actually spent for medical treatment by way of prescription. If any retrospective effect has been given to it, I have no objection.

On page 3 is Demand No. 10. This demand relates to the expenditure on cars purchased for the use of the hon. Ministers. During June 1967, Government accorded sanction for purchase of six new cars and during October 1967 they again accorded sanction for purchase of 14 cars. What made them to give sanction in dribblets? They have so far purchased 14 cars out of 17. Where was the need for them? What happened to the old cars? I want to know whether they would have dealt with their private money in the same reckless manner. These cars were purchased long ago. Every year they have been extravagant and spending the people's money in any manner they like. I want them to examine the previous records and see whether this was the practice in former regimes. Were they making purchases of cars like this? Now they are a big group. They are not only five Ministers. They come to 28 or 30 and how can they purchase cars in this indiscriminate manner? This amount of Rs. 2,75,000 that has been now sought, has already been drawn and spent; now they want to regularise the expenditure. I feel they have no sense of economy. They do not know how to economise the public funds. They deal with them in any manner they like, like the profligate son, who does not bother what people will say, who does not bother whether he will have a paisa in his pocket the next morning. Nobody bothers in the Government. Money is given to their hands; they have the purse in their hand; they have the treasury and its key; and they open it and spend the money in any manner they like. I charge the Finance Minister that he has not carefully examined this question. He has not tried to plug the hole and see that this expenditure was not allowed to be incurred.

Then I take Demand No. 15 on page No. 6. So far as this Department of Information and Publicity is concerned, they have charged Rs. 15 lakhs for advertisement purposes. I would have had no quarrel with them if they had brought this expenditure in the year 1967-68 when the original Budget was taken. After all, it is not a New Service. While I was the Minister in charge of Information and Publicity, my friends will see by comparison and contrast that far less was spent on advertisement charges; for one year we were spending Rs. One lakh on advertisement. All the same we had better advertisement. But then these gentlemen want to say that when advertisements are given, they pay to industries and then try to palm it on to industries.

Sri D. M. SIDDAlAH (Beligere).—There are a large number of pending bills.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I have no objection. But let them take as much money as is necessary while placing the demand in the original demands. In the year 1967-68 itself, they could have come forward and said: this is what we want for Information and Publicity. Where is the dire necessity to spend Rs. 15 lakhs and take the vote of this House? Why do they come before us after having spent the money and ask the expenditure to be sanctioned? I feel, Sir, this is not the proper way the amount is to be spent. There is something radically wrong with these people. I do not know for what advertisement and for what purpose they spent.

I come now to Demand No. 17. I said, I would say one or two words about Jail when I refer to this demand. So far as Demand 17 is concerned, they say, it is a New Service. Take item No. 2.

“The State Level Committee of Eighth Centenary Celebration of Sri Basaveswara has requested the State Government to sanction financial assistance to meet the expenditure of Printing and Publication of Commemoration volume, Biographical sketch and Shatsthala Vachanagalu. A grant of Rs. 2 lakhs was sanctioned for the purpose in December 1967. As this constituted an item of ‘New Service,’ an advance of Rs. 2 lakhs was sanctioned from the Contingency Fund in February 1968. An equivalent amount is now required to enable repayment to be made to that Fund. The amount of Rs. 2 lakhs can be found by reappropriation of savings under the Major Head and therefore only a token demand of Rs. 100 has been placed.”

Sir, let me not be misunderstood by any side of the House. My fundamental objection to this is, Lord Basava does not require any proping from these gentlemen; he does not require any help from the Government of Mysore because his tenets are very many and his followers are so large in number and they themselves could afford to spend more than this paltry sum of Rs. 2 lakhs. Many are doing it by their own individual effort. This has caused unnecessarily a kind of feeling in the country that because the ruling class belongs to a predominantly majority community, they have spent this amount. Sir, I belong to the same community and I feel hurt. The other day hon. members Sri Sayanak and Sri Azeez Sait mentioned it. While every community has got a right to pronounce and propagate its own religion no community has any right to demand any public funds for this purpose. The Minister said the other day: ‘let Madhwa come, I will give; let anybody come. I will give.’ Is this for this purpose we spend public funds? What will others think? These gentlemen have insulted that great personage Lord Basava. Sir, there was a private agency and there was a private institution; it was ably managed by Sri B. D. Jatti.

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA)

Why did Government poke its nose? Under this you wanted to cater to the public feeling and create some good feeling in your favour. I know Lord Basava was a great great man and he was not God. Sir, in the radio, we hear in the morning Sri Lord Venkateshwara Suprabhatam; we hear Suprabhatam of Lord Mallikarjuna. Now, they have started the Suprabhatam of Basava. Lord Basava was an ordinary man. But, like Mahatma Gandhi he became Lord Basava by preaching to people unity and brotherhood, to whatever persuasions they may belong. I have my own doubts whether this amount has been properly spent. I think, this amount has been misutilised in many instances. Where Lord Basava taught one unity and brotherhood of man, in the case of those that follow his own persuasion and his own preachings, after starting this Lord Basava Centenary have created divergent feelings and divergent feelings have come up to the surface. I can show, even when they invited people to go there, there was lot of discrimination. In some cases but for my interference — this would be borne testimony by the D.C. and the D.S.P. of Bellary — there would have been hundreds of murders on a particular day when some of these people had gone to take part in the celebrations and return. Therefore, I feel, Government of Mysore is wrong in having taken up this cause of observing the Centenary of Lord Basava. If it had been left to the private agency under the Chairmanship of Sri B. D. Jatti, they could have done it in a finer manner than these gentlemen.

While casually mentioning it, some person from jail has addressed a letter to me. There he says: Now they have been observing Lord Basaweshwara Centenary. Lord Basava was so humane and was so kind including to a thief. When a thief went to thief the jewels of Lord Basava's house and when Lord Basava found his wife keeping quiet, he scolded his wife and said: 'you, women, why are you keeping quiet? Remove the jewels and give them to him; he is in greater need of it.' At least to show they are sincere, let them release all the prisoners in the jail except those convicted under 302, I.P.C. so that they may lead a better life.

This is what he writes. At least in this case, translate it into action and show that Lord Basaweshwara Centenary was not observed merely to instil the preachings and teachings of that great man but to show it in your actions as administrators. He was also a Minister and you know how he administered the State. Compare yourselves; you will come to know how he was great. Therefore, I prefaced saying, let not anybody mistake when I mention about this. I have my reverence; I have my respect towards Lord Basava. I am a follower of Lord Basava. Our Lord Basava was not a quadruped animal merely to be worshipped. He showed in action what he taught. If you follow at least a small portion of his teaching, you will do well in serving the

State and not merely by going to Delhi and request great personages to preside over the function. What we want is practice ; practice is not to be found here. Therefore, I oppose this Demand.

Then, Demand No. 20 at page 11 — Agriculture. In this case, I refer to only item 3— rat menace. Sir, I have seen it personally how the agriculturists of Bhadra area, they shed tears actually, and rats have eaten away nearly 50 per cent of the paddy crop last year. These rates are so imune, even if you put poison, they do not die. I do not know whether I can give an analogy but I refrain.

Sri B. P. KADAM (Karwar).—Just like Ministers and Officers who can eat money and still be imune. *laughter*

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—About this rat nuisance, when the Chief Minister was in charge of Agriculture portfolio, I wrote a letter to him. I do not know whether it was brought to his notice. At any rate, there are other Ministers who have the courtesies to reply.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—Did you not get a letter from the Department ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I wrote to the Department also and they have sent a reply. But I have greater confidence and love to my Chief Minister than the Department.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA. — That is a great news.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The department people have manned it very well. What I am saying is, for this rat nuisance they have shown a pittance of 2 lakhs which in my opinion they could have saved lakhs of acres of crops. My objection is that it is not done properly. What I find is, there are any number of new posts being created, I have fundamental objection for these new posts being created. If at all they have succeeded, they have succeeded only in creating any number of new posts of officers, which I am going to show very soon how they have not succeeded. What is the expenditure they have sought for and what is the establishment they have appointed ?

12 Noon.

Sri A. P. APPANNA (Deputy Minister for Industries).—If the Hon'ble member were to yield. What about the monkey menace ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—It is worse ; do whatever you like to give us food.

Demand 23—This is an important development about co-operation. The moment the word 'co-operation' is mentioned I feel giddy about it—not guilty, because the way they have functioned. This is an important Demand which is an eye-opener, to show how the funds are managed. I reliably learn from what I have read in the papers that the Administrative Reforms Commission has strongly recommended for the abolition of Co-operative Department itself. That will be a happy day. We

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA)

will pray God to see that this department is removed lock, stock and barrel from the Mysore State because if there is any department which has become a beehive for all sorts of corruption, nepotism and what not, it is only the Co-operative Department. You will see why they have created 40 posts of senior grade Inspectors—it is because they have given a lot of money to banks and these banks have fallen into arrears and they have become bad debts. They have not shown what the bad debts are. They have asked for a token grant of Rs. 100 but my feeling is that it will run into several crores and the pity is, all these are manned by congressmen. If I am correct, 99 per cent of these societies are manned by congressmen. In all these District Banks, Primary Banks, all these moneys have gone to fatten the congressmen. I know there are very many cases where money is shown as being received by somebody and that somebody does not know whether he has taken the loan. With a view to make the account accurate, the Reserve Bank is sitting tight. They would not believe that these people will manage well. I know when Sri Venkatapathiah was there, they examined all these things when this scheme was originally thought. Now, most of these moneys, I am sure, will not be recovered at all. They are bound to become bad debts. The Government says here that “with a view to take action, sanction was accorded during December 1967 for the creation of 40 posts of senior grade Inspectors in the Co-operation Department for a period of six months”. I am sure, this will go on for 60 years and six months is just a beginning. That is why, I want a committee to be appointed; let them examine all aspects as in the case of Khadi Bhandar. I feel that this Demand must be opposed. But it must be an eye-opener to show how floods have been swelling and why this money should not be sanctioned.

Demands 29 and 30. With regard to this Public Works Department, I feel there is a lot of avoidable waste. Expenditure can be minimised. Where is the point in having hundreds of circles; where is the need for having nearly half a dozen Chief Engineers, thousands of Executive Engineers and Assistant Engineers, when this Government has no money to spend? Take any question coming before the House, the reply given by the Minister, Deputy Minister is, there is no money. Their one slogan is ‘no money’. So, when there is no money why should they go on spending for the staff? Probably 50 per cent of the funds are spent only on establishment. They have opened a Circle for instance for Upper Krishna. They have spent about 18 lakhs or 20 lakhs, last year. There is a Superintending Engineer, many Executive Engineers and various hierarchy of officers and none of them have any work. What is the purpose? Not that our officers are incapable of working. I am not casting any aspersion. Each one of them is a competent officer to do not only the work that is given to him but perhaps ten fold of it. But unfortunately we have all come at a stage

when the finances of the State have been drained, have been completely sapped and there are no funds available for spending in the Public Works Department. With the present set up even if we give 50 crores, it can be spent profitably. When finances are not there, you must try to find sources and see the works are estimated. That is the point. I oppose formation of these zones and circles. They ought not to have been done and it is not correct for them to do.

Demand 31—In item 2, on page 21, it is stated that in January 1968 a new Water Supply Division (with 3 sub-divisions) at Mangalore for Water Supply Scheme to Fertiliser Factory was created. We know that we have nothing to do about it. This Fertiliser Factory at Mangalore is the private concern where the Government have no interest in it. Why should you of all people, think of supplying water to them? If it is a private concern it is for them to make their own supply because once finances are given, you have power. If they have given, by all means give them. I do not see why the Government of Mysore should do it. When poor people want for irrigation, for drinking, you have no water because the poor 'Boregowda' does not know how to approach you. When this Fertiliser Factory comes, you want to do it. I want to know more details. Why should the Government spend? Have you committed? If so, what are the reasons that prompted you to do so?

Demand 38—Item 1—"Sanction was accorded during July 1967 to the scheme for raising of Oil Palm Plantation in about 50 acres". They want to start oil-palm plantation in 50 acres. Now, you see the number of posts they have created. For doing this work they have created a Deputy Conservator of Forests, one Range Officer, one Accountant, one Typist and two Peons. How much will that work out to per annum? I think it is perhaps as much as the scheme itself.

SRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Minister for Finance and Industries).—No, Sir.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Why should you not ask the officers concerned and why do you want special staff for it. Now, it has become a habit to have special staff for ragi, special staff for jola and special staff for each and every crop. Take any crop and you will find that there are as many special schemes and special staff as there are crops that we grow in Mysore. This kind of thing is really very bad. This is not the way in which things should be managed. After all, the Director of Agriculture is the person who knows how to do it. Perhaps when a scheme is started, they start with the presumption that new staff must be created. It may do some good by way of mitigating unemployment. So far as this scheme is concerned, it does not redound to the credit of the Government.

Coming to Demand No. 43 on page 27, so far as M/s. Mysore Acetate & Chemicals Co. Ltd., Mandya is concerned, they want to provide water supply at a cost of Rs. 6.98 lakhs. I do not know why they should do it. They can afford these amenities themselves instead of spending the poor tax-payer's money in this way.

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA)

So far as M/s. Malabar Chemicals & Fertilisers Ltd., Mangalore, is concerned, for raw water supply they want to spend money. I personally feel that it is not correct to do it. You must ask the factory people to spend the money for whatever they need and it is not the responsibility of the State to spend money for that.

With regard to Demand No. 44, on page 29 you will see that the Mysore State Financial Corporation has so far given Rs. 568 lakhs out of which Rs. 452 lakhs have been disbursed. There is a further commitment to the extent of Rs. 114 lakhs and so many applications are still in the process of being examined. If there are certain industrial concerns which deserve financial help and if they give money to them nobody can have objection. But they have given money for industries which are dead or which are about to be dead. These Industries are suffering not from T.B. but from a more chronic and deadly disease, namely, cancer. Moneys are given to those concerns and I can give a list of those concerns wherein money has been spent in a way in which they ought not to have spent it. Therefore, I take objection to it.

With regard to Demand No. 45 relating to irrigation works, my friend Sri Sivappa casually mentioned about them. With regard to these various projects, you have taken from suspense debts, suspense credits and what not. On page 37 you have given a list of non-budgetted fresh works constituting an item of 'New Service'. Where is the need for you to do it and could you not have waited to put them in the actual budget for 1968-69 and leave it to the House to decide whether these schemes should be taken up, whether they have priority over other schemes and so on and so forth. Why did you give such a huge amount and when do you spend it? In the month of March! Is it correct? I request the Hon'ble Finance Minister to examine whether this is the way of budgeting?

Then, we have Demand No. 48 on page 43. It is said that they want some amount for the construction of a first floor to Raj Bhavan and they have sanctioned one lakh of rupees. During the time of the Britishers that Raj Bhavan was there; it is there since 150 years. I am sure they led a very luxurious life than we who comparatively are the poorer section of the world. Where was the need to do it and why did you permit such a huge amount being spent? The other day the Hon'ble Finance Minister vaxed eloquent and said that they are high dignitaries and that nothing should be discussed which would affect their dignity. The item may be charged and we may not have the right to vote on it, but we have the right to express our opinion. It is perhaps unparalleled in the history of any State that in a particular year as was mentioned by the hon. Member Sri Channabasappa—he raised a hare and left it and unfortunately he was not present when the reply was given; I wish he were present—the Government has spent Rs. 17 lakhs for hospitality. Even British monarchs would not spend so much in one year. Now,

you want this building to be improved; you want to add a first floor. Where is the need? If the whole building is fully utilised, it must be able to satisfy the needs of any ordinary citizen of India. By all means, give him all facilities and all luxuries. You have given only one lakh now and I do not know where it will stop; it is just a beginning. I therefore strongly oppose it and you are spending it without knowing that you are doing a great disservice to the State.

On page 46, the demand number is not mentioned.

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.—I would invite the attention of the hon. Member to the explanatory note given along with the Supplementary budget. Both these are charged items.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—They are charged items. Even they have come before us and let us express what we have to say about it. This is one thing I have been harping right from the beginning. This is the biggest item of expenditure in this and it comes to Rs. 17,70,08,000. All this is the debt charges and this is the asset that our friends have given to us. Item No. 2 is very revealing. It says:

“The Budget provision both for the repayment of ways and means advances and the overdraft to the Reserve Bank of India is Rs. 82 crores. According to the procedure of gross budgeting, provision will have to be made for the total repayment not taking into account the receipts. The repayment made up to end of January 1968 during the current financial year towards the Ways and Means Advances and overdraft with the Reserve Bank of India was Rs. 75.76 crores. The total transactions to end of March 1968 may be of the order of Rs. 95 crores. An additional sum of Rs. 13 crores would, therefore, be necessary. Hence the appropriation. This is covered by increased receipt of Ways and Means Advances to the extent of Rs. 3.60 crores and receipt of *ad hoc* loan of Rs. 11.40 crores from the Government of India”.

If the Government of India do not give it, you could have left it blank. Perhaps, you were persuading them and requesting them. And, now, they have given this dole to us, and it has come up as a “New Service”. I personally feel that this kind of too much dependence upon the Government of India takes away the sovereignty of this House. That is why I have been requesting them and saying: “cut your coat according to your cloth”. It may be a developing economy. But, the moment you just pinch it, it bursts out. This is an eye-opener for us. Sir, even with regard to the ‘Ways and Means’ advances, the position is not very happy, and even the Hon’ble Finance Minister, in a way, has admitted it. You will be pleased to see that the earlier Supplementary Estimates were within tolerable limits; the first one was for Rs. 3.47 crores—I can very well understand that is really a Supplementary Estimate that could come up in managing the affairs of the

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA)

State. The second one was for Rs. 3.79 crores. But now it is for Rs. 19.6 crores. The actual total outgoing of the money may not be much. I know the Hon'ble Finance Minister will say that the outgoing of money is not much. I am not unaware of it. But, this is not the way the Budget should be prepared, the public finances should be managed. I, therefore, strongly, oppose this Supplementary Demand.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—I now call upon hon'ble member Sri H. D. Deve Gowda to speak. In view of the fact that Sri H. Siddaveerappa has covered a very wide ground, I request Sri Deve Gowda to be brief.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಡಿ. ದೇವೇಗೌಡ (ಹೊಳೇನರಸೀಪುರ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಚ್ಛಾರತ್ನ ಮೂರನೆಯ ಕಂತಿನ ಸ್ವಾಮೀಂದಿ ಎಸ್.ಸಿ.ಬಿ.ಯನ್ನು ಕುರಿತು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಿದ್ದೇಶ್ವರಪ್ಪನವರು ಬಹಳ ಸುದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಾರಾವಕಾಶ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಅಂದಾಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲ ಅರ್ಥ ಸಚಿವರು new service ಎಂದು ತೋರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪ್ರಸಕ್ತ ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಬರ್ಚನ್ನೂ ತೋರಿಸಬಹುದಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಹಾಗೆ ಅದನ್ನು 1967-68ರ ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡದೇ ಇದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಮೀಂದಿ ಎಸ್.ಸಿ.ಬಿ.ಯಲ್ಲಿ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೇನು ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ತಿಳಿದಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದೇ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ತಾವು ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಏನು ಒಂದು ರೂಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ಇದೇ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಿದರೋ ಆ ರೂಲಿಂಗಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸ್ವಾಮೀಂದಿ ಎಸ್.ಸಿ.ಬಿ.ಯಿಗೂ ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿದೆ. ಅದು ಹೇಗೆ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿದೆ ಅನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಅನೇಕ ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬಲ್ಲೆ. ವಿವರಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬಲ್ಲೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ಲನೇಟರಿ ನೋಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ದೂರವಾದ್ದು ಅನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ನಾನೀಗ ನಿಂತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಸ್ವಾಮೀಂದಿ ಎಸ್.ಸಿ.ಬಿ.ಯನ್ನು ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಇನ್ನು ವರ್ಷ ಮುಗಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದೆರಡು ತಿಂಗಳು ಇದೆ ಅನ್ನುವಾಗಲೇ ತರುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅತ್ತ ಕಪೆ ಇರಾಖೆಯವರು ನೀವು ಇಷ್ಟು ಹಣವನ್ನು ತಂದು ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ ಮಾರ್ಚ್ ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಬರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಾವೇನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಅನ್ನುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದೇ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಆಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರೂ ಸಹಾ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ತನ್ನ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸ್ವಾಮೀಂದಿ ಎಸ್.ಸಿ.ಬಿ.ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಷ್ಟು ಬಾಬುಗಳ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ ಮಾರ್ಚ್ ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ರಿಲೀಡ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಇದರ ಔಚಿತ್ಯವೇನು? ಇದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಮುಂಜಾಗ್ರತೆಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗೆ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಮುಂಜಾಗ್ರತೆಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಇದು ಎತ್ತಿ ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತದೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ನಂಬರ್ 18, ಪುಟ 10ರಲ್ಲಿ ಇವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ಲನೇಟರಿ ನೋಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನ್ಯೂ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಬೇಕಾದ ಕೆಲಸದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅನುವಾನ ಆಧಾರ ಒಂದು ಸಂತಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಪುಟ 8ರಲ್ಲಿ ಅದೇ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ನಂಬರ್ 18ರಲ್ಲಿ ಇವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ಲನೇಟರಿ ನೋಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೋ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಕಂಬೆಂಡ್ ಡಿಸ್ಪೆನ್ಸರಿಯನ್ನು ತೆರೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ಟೆಲಿಫೋನ್ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಷ್ಟೂ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಇವರು ಇನ್ನು ಕೆಲವು 2 ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ? ಈ ಮಾರ್ಚ್ 31 ರೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಅಷ್ಟು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಬರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಕಂಡು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಟೋಕನ್ ಗ್ಯಾಂಟ್ 100 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಣಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಇಷ್ಟು ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನು ಇದೇ ತಿಂಗಳು ಮಾರ್ಚ್ 31ರಲ್ಲಿ ಬರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಇರಿಗೇಷನ್ ಬಾಬಿಗೆ ಬಂದರೆ—ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಿಗಿಲ್ಲಾ ಇವರು ಚೆಂಡರನ್ನೂ ಸಹಾ ಕರೆದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವರ ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ಟಿನ ವಿಚಕ್ಷಣೆ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗಿದೆ ನೋಡಿ !

ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ದಿವಸ ಪಿ. ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು. ಡಿ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್‌ವೆಸ್ಟಿಗೇಷನ್ ಸರ್ಕರ್ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಇನ್‌ವೆಸ್ಟಿಗೇಷನ್ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪವನ್ನು ವಜಾಪಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ರಾಜಿ ಯೇನೂ ಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆರಾಮ ದಿವಸವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಡಿಫೆ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಥಾನವನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಇದನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಜೋನ್ಸ್ ಸಿಸ್ಟಂ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರು ನನ್ನ ಅಡ್ಡಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಇಂಥ ಸಣ್ಣ ಪುಟ್ಟದಕ್ಕೆ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಒಂದು ಜೋನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಇನ್ನೂ ೨-3 ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಅವಧಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಇದನ್ನು ಎಸರೆಸುತ್ತಾ ಹೋಗುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಆಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಬೇಕಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಸೈಲೆಟ್ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಯನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟರೆ ಡಾನ್ವಿಯಾಯಿತು. ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ಲೇನೇಟರಿ ನೋಟಿನಿಂದ ಹೊರಪಡುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಮಂಗಳೂರಿನ ನೀರಿನ ಸರಬರಾಯಿ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ೨ ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಲು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಈ ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ ಮಾರ್ಚ್ ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿರೆಯೇ? ಆದರೆ ನಾನು ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವ ವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನೂ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಅರ್ಧ ಸಚಿವರು ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಯೋಜನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಒಂದನ್ನಾದರೂ ಮುಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿದೆ ಅನ್ನುವಂಥ ಒಂದು ಭರವಸೆಯನ್ನು ಅವರು ಕೊಡಬಲ್ಲರೇ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅಥವಾ ಅವರು ಒಂದು ಭರವಸೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದು ಅಥವಾ ಕಾಪಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

12-30 P.M.

18 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರು ಕಂಟ್ರಾಕ್ಟರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯೇನು? ಯಾವುದೇ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣವಿಲ್ಲ, ದುಡ್ಡು ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವ ಕಾರಣಗಳೇನು? financial stability ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಕಂಟ್ರಾಕ್ಟರುಗಳು ಇವರಿಗೆ ಸಿಗಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ? ಆ ವ್ಯವಹಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇವರು ನಡೆಸಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ನಾವು ಬಹಳ ವಿಪಾದಪಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದು ಖಂಡಿತ ಸರಿಯಾದುದಲ್ಲ. ಇವತ್ತು ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೆಲವು ಐಟಂಗಳಿವೆ. ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಇರುವುದು ಮಾರ್ಚ್ 31ರವರೆಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಐಟಂಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ರೂಪಾಯಿಯನ್ನು ಸಹ ಬಡ್ಡಿ ಮಾಡದೆ ಹೊಸ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ? ಅದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಇವತ್ತು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ದೇಶ್ವರನವರು ಬಹಳ ಮೃದುವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಕಾರುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು. ಇದೇ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದೆ ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು 20 ಕಾರುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಕಾರುಗಳು ಏನಾದುವು? ಒಂದು ಕಾರಿನ ಆಯಸ್ಸು ಎಷ್ಟು? ನಮ್ಮ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಸನ್ನಿತಿ ಏನು ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಅವರ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ unprofitable worksಗೆ ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆಸ್ತಿಗಳ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಕೆಲವು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ unproductive worksಗೆ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದು ಅತ್ಯಗತ್ಯವಾದಂಥ ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ತಮ್ಮ ವಾದಸರಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಇನ್ನಿತರ ಬಾಬಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನಿವಾರ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವುದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ವಾದ ಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಅದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಗಂಟೆ ಬಾರಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಇನ್ನೂ ಬಹಳ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯ. ಹೇಮಾವತಿ ಪಾಜೆಕ್ಟಿಗಾಗಿ 30 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ್ಳು ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ ಒದಗಿಸಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅದನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗದೆ ಕೇವಲ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಗಾಗಿ ಸುಮಾರು 8-10 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಸ್ತಿಯೆಂಬುದು ಹೇಳ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಕೇವಲ ಕೆಲವು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅದನ್ನು ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಪ್ರಿಯೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಡಿಮಾಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಸುಮಾರು ಏಳು ವರ್ಷದಿಂದ 8 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಯೋಜನೆಗಾಗಿ 10 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಗಾಗಿ ಇವರು ಏಕೆ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕು? ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಬಹಳ ಇದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದು ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಸರಿಯಾದುದಲ್ಲ ವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—The Hon'ble Member must finish. There is voting to-day.

Sri J. P. SARVESH (Serum).—There are several members to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—I have no objection if the members desire.

The House will stand adjourned and meet tomorrow at 1 P.M.

The House adjourned at Thirty-five Minutes past Twelve of the Clock to meet again at One of the Clock on Monday, the 18th March 1968.
